



MAUT Annual General Meeting

Thursday, April 20, 2023 | 12 pm

Zoom Meeting

Approved Minutes

1. Welcome

Renee Sieber MAUT President, called the meeting to order at 12:05 pm and welcomed Executive, Council and Members to the MAUT Annual General Meeting. There were 66 guests (61 full members, 3 retired members and 2 MAUT staff).

2. Adoption of Agenda

Members reviewed the Agenda. Ken Hastings moved to adopt the Agenda, seconded by Andrew Kirk. The agenda was adopted unanimously.

3. Adoption of Minutes AGM April 2022

Members reviewed the Minutes. Andrew Kirk moved to adopt the Minutes, seconded by Valerie Orsat. The Minutes of 2022 were adopted unanimously.

4. [Constitutional Amendments CAS \[C. Riches\]](#)

Caroline Riches explained the amendments to the Constitution where Contract Academic Staff (CAS) would have representation (a seat) on council. She went on to say that there were provisions for CAS in the Constitution but it predated the creation of MCLUI (McGill Course Lecturers and University Instructors). A few modifications were made in terms of redesigning seats on Council.

Caroline presented the motion: Be it resolved that the following proposed amendments to the MAUT Constitution be adopted. Nate Quitoriano moved the motion, seconded by Jelena Ristic. Renee opened the floor for discussion but first shared that while she's been President, one of her goals was to give non tenure track members more of a voice who are contract academic staff (who work part-time as professors). Caroline further explained that CAS faculty are divided into ranked and unranked categories. Ranked includes faculty lecturers, senior faculty lecturers, assistant and associate professors and full professors. Unranked include associate members and other distinctions. There are a number of CAS at McGill with the highest volume in medicine. The tasks and roles of CAS are along side tenure track academic staff and perform the same duties. They are an integral part of McGill but do not have the same benefits of TT professors (job security, benefits, not eligible for sabbatical). Moving forward, part of MAUT's mission is to create more equity for CAS. Council and members discussed the similarity in how a seat on Council will resemble RAC and LS. CAS members must make 50% or more of their salary to be eligible for membership. Nil salary are excluded. *Because the meeting did not meet quorum (100 or more required to vote), the motion was withdrawn and will be circulated via e-vote by email.*

5. Executive Reports

- [President Report \[R. Sieber\]](#)

- Academic Freedom
MAUT has been successful in pushing back on some of the initial proposals like removing institutional autonomy from the current draft proposal on academic freedom. As such, one cannot be complacent with new model of academic program delivery from the university administration, changes to the research ethics board policy, and treatment of human subjects. We need to be engaged in collegiality and academic life.
- Asbestos and Town Halls
MAUT held two successful town halls, one for MAC campus and the other for Stewart Biology. Policy documents were created and presented to the Deans and Provost following those town halls. MAUT set up an emergency meeting with the principal and with the Provost with an update on the situation at Stewart Biology which prompted asbestos testing.
- MAUT and AMPLE
For the first time in McGill University's history, the Faculty of Law unionized (AMPL – Association of McGill Professors of Law). MAUT has not stood in the way of their formation and seeking necessary resources.
- Crunching the numbers on CASC
MAUT met with CASC (Committee for Academic Staff Compensation) and were able to nudge the needle a little on across the board increase and merit. Historically, the university has come to us with our position in the U15, (there are 17 research universities in Canada), and how our salary and compensation position vis-à-vis, the Quebec universities. By crunching our own numbers this year, we found that among other things, the university's constant refrain that we do the best of all the Quebec universities is not true. Other entities have larger salaries as reported to Statistics Canada.
- Working with MCC and SBAC
MCC (McGill Community Council) has representation from different groups at McGill and have been working together in coordinating their asks in having a greater voice on SBAC (Staff Benefits Advisory Committee).
- MAUT is not just tenure track staff
It is important to know that MAUT is not just tenure track staff but also in addition to CAS, there are academic librarians who had a rough last year. MAUT worked extensively with the Provost with the new Dean of Libraries to try to make positive changes for them.

- [Professional and Legal Officer Report \[J. Varga\]](#)

Joseph Varga gave a brief overview of his report as per the link above.

- [VP Internal Report \[J. Ristic\]](#)

Jelena Ristic, quickly covered the following two points (details can be found in her report along with other activities she was involved in):

- Consultations on the new Electronic Expense Management Software Chrome River
MAUT was part of the consultation process but has been put on hold. Updates will be reported when there is movement on this consultation.
- Mid-Career Mentoring
This effort was initiated by RAC which was geared towards women and minorities.

- [VP External Report \[V. Muniz-Fraticelli\]](#)

Victor Muniz-Fraticelli summarized his involvement with FQPPU and CAUT in his report as per the link above.

MAUT Annual General Meeting

Thursday, April 20, 2023 | 12 pm

- **[VP Finance Report](#) [K. Bevan]**

Kirk Bevan reported that he is in the process of consolidating MAUT's finances (move the investments all to one place and take the surplus funds residing at McGill and place them under the investments as well). It is an ongoing process. Detailed breakdown can be found in the auditor's financial statement below:

- [2022 Financial Statement](#)

- **[VP Communications Report](#) [S. Jordan]**

Steve Jordan reported that he is responsible for putting the MAUT Newsletter which covers a range of issues that's pertinent to members and that we also post communications through social media. He encouraged all attendees to submit articles of interest to him.

- **[President-Elect Report](#) [P. Grutter]**

Peter Grutter began by saying that he would like to concentrate on four major themes related to increased workload and unproductive bureaucracy and encouraged everyone to provide him with concrete examples of administrative overload that can be presented to the administration (expense reports, hiring in Workday, purchasing, marketplace - PCard, travel reimbursements, IT support, etc.). There is also the purchasing of new software (expense reports) testing and quality control before rolling out to campus wide.

- **[Past-President Election Results](#) [A. Kirk]**

Andrew Kirk thanked the members of the Nominating Committee for their participation and for canvassing nominees for Executive and Council. Andrew was pleased to share that it was a competitive election with several nominations received.

- 12 nominations for five (5) Council seats
- Two nominations for VP Communications
- Two nominations for President-Elect
- Other positions were acclaimed
- There was a nomination for chair of RAC but that person had to withdraw (Bruce Shore will stay on until a replacement is found)

A total of 265 MAUT members voted (27% of eligible voting members). The following are the results (details are in the Election Results Report):

Elected to Council:

- Benjamin Forest
- Catherine Lu
- Lisa Munter
- Caroline Riches
- Ipek Tureli

Elected to Executive:

- Nate Quitoriano, President-Elect
- Steve Jordan, VP Communications

Acclaimed to Executive:

- Jelena Ristic, VP Internal
- Victor Muniz-Fraticelli, VP External
- Kirk Bevan, VP Finance

6. Open Discussion Items

Merit and Salary Policy at McGill (led by J. Ristic, P. Grutter, and A. Kirk)

J. Ristic presented the results from the recent merit procedures survey and discussed historical and current practices of merit and salary policy at McGill. Full Merit Survey Report [HERE](#).

MAUT Annual General Meeting

Thursday, April 20, 2023 | 12 pm

J. Ristic began by providing a short overview of what she along with P. Grutter and A. Kirk worked on during the past year in understanding the process and how with their administrative knowledge were informative as a group.

Presentation video: [Merit and Salary Policy @McGill](#) – Overview

- Merit @ McGill: Historical and current perspectives
- MAUT Survey on Merit Procedures
 - Implementation: Procedures
 - Transparency: Appeal, Performance Dialogue, Anomaly Requests

Discussion: Future of Merit @ McGill: Discussion Items

- *How do you feel about merit?*
- *Where is merit equitable and where it is not?*
- *Do we argue for an alternative excellence recognition system?*
- *If so, what would that system be?*

J. Ristic opened the floor to members for questions and discussion:

- Is there data by faculty, the 40% gets category one? Is that true for all faculty or are there faculties had 70% get category one, or 20%?

The data and the breakdown is fairly similar, there's little variance. The pattern seen (broken by a rank) holds across a major faculties across the university. It's not that one faculty will have everyone in category one, and others will have it distributed. What is interesting is that this kind of diversity process produces somewhat consistent data across the units. The salary mass for each department or faculty gets to increase the salaries (to distribute within merit process) is linked - 80% of that salary mass was what you would have needed to give everybody a category to second highest merit increase. Essentially, by design, it leads to the same result that nearly everyone gets the two highest categories. Some faculty/departments get not only 30% potential, and others get nine or similar to that. Andy added that in terms of the distribution from assistant to associate to full, that it will vary by faculty (there can be variations from one faculty to another).

- How do we know which major category we are assessed to be at since it's a letter that's not providing information?

One needs to initiate a discussion with their chair and ask, how and where they fare in relation to others. The chair should be able to provide information, if not, then one can initiate an appeal process to the dean.

- Where is merit equitable and where it is not?

Merit exercises are, by definition, inequitable. There are some people at McGill doing incredible work and they should be rewarded. We need to think about the way that the majority of our salary increase should be determined, and the ability to serve - excel should not be tied to whether or not you get a pay cut, which can happen, if you don't get a category one or two. We need to advocate for ensuring that those doing their job essentially are doing what they're hired to do (and are not getting pay cuts) as with under a 4% raise these days is an effective pay cut. The aggregate data shows that the merit exercise has the effect of atomizing the faculty and keeping everyone in their bubble while we fall behind other peer institutions – U15 ranking. We don't have a more collective means of determining our salary and it is sort of hidden in this very opaque exercise of merit has to factor into that.

- What are the differences between across the board (ATB) versus merit percentages?

P. Grutter explained how the merit exercise affects different salaries in different ways (how much merit do you want versus how much across the board). The challenge with the merit part really depends on two things, what your current salary is, and what your merit increase is. Only then can you question - are we beating inflation or going backwards? This is compounded over 3 years (examples below) and this is why it makes it so difficult to compare with other universities in terms of their pay, increase, etc. The Board of Governors is strongly in favor of merit but the question is how big that component is? We are working with the data provided to figure out how to make that argument and which direction we should take.

ATB vs merit impact

current salary \$ 100,000				current salary \$ 140,000				current salary \$ 200,000			
Increase [%]	salary 2023/24: (ATB & merit)	Merit amount	category	Increase [%]	salary 2023/24: (ATB & merit)	Merit amount	category	Increase [%]	salary 2023/24: (ATB & merit)	Merit amount	category
7.0%	\$ 107,000	\$6,000	category 1	5.3%	\$ 147,400	\$6,000	category 1	4.0%	\$ 208,000	\$6,000	category 1
5.3%	\$ 105,300	\$4,300	category 2	4.1%	\$ 145,700	\$4,300	category 2	3.2%	\$ 206,300	\$4,300	category 2
3.6%	\$ 103,600	\$2,600	category 3	2.9%	\$ 144,000	\$2,600	category 3	2.3%	\$ 204,600	\$2,600	category 3
2.3%	\$ 102,300	\$1,300	category 4	1.9%	\$ 142,700	\$1,300	category 4	1.7%	\$ 203,300	\$1,300	category 4

Comments:

Comments from some members were in agreement with merit exercise (incentive, recognition for hard work and being rewarded) but this is not a true merit exercise (as an example, for a strongly performing dept. it is not possible for everyone to receive category one. If the system was such that there was an envelope, with clearer criteria, and benchmarking than what has been demonstrated exists, it would theoretically be possible that these people get category one, then I would say that's a good thing.) In practice, these envelopes have to be divided up and it becomes unclear who gets bumped down. This can lead to resentment (you think you've hit a benchmark that is worthy of a higher category than what you receive), is negative. The presentation shows that 20% of faculty received a category three to five or below. People are working for 20% less just by doing their job. The hypothesis is category four or five is doing their job. But certainly in category three, no has met inflation of 4.3% this year.

As general information, Chairs should have a list of salary versus time since you were hired and should be able to show you where you are in comparison to everyone else (without knowing names) in your department. This should give you an indication where you are and if you've been unfairly treated or if you are doing well. These points have been brought to administration and that category three should be the normative performance and anything above is *above* normative performance and below category three is a minority of faculty body - is below normative. J. Ristic added that by working with the administration, they

MAUT Annual General Meeting

Thursday, April 20, 2023 | 12 pm

have been able to make progress and now there is a way in which faculty can ask for information without formally having an audit or launching into the appeals process.

While others were against merit, it was mentioned that in a 2007 MAUT survey, 50% of the respondents supported merit and the other 50% were against merit (would be interesting to know what they would want as an alternative). There is empirical evidence that putting so much of our salary into merit is anti-collegial and that merit induces unnecessary competitiveness into a faculty unit and distrust (the misconception that without merit, people would work less hard).

To the above point, it is incredibly difficult to empirically capture toxicity. But the university data gathered shows that most people do well with merit. Learning what the major stumbling points are, will help fix the merit system. An added comment from Council, is that not all employers are forthcoming when it comes to salary transparency and merit. Though some are in a favor of merit there is inequity of salary increases between some faculties and professors. One must also consider that the university budget is bound by money we receive from the government and from student enrollment which is regulated. How do we advocate if the system is no longer satisfactory and how do we show the data that they have moving forward? These are hard questions for MAUT to think about.

7. Adjournment

R. Sieber expressed her appreciation over the past year as President and thanked everyone for their support for attending the AGM. She extended an invitation to a social gathering at the Faculty Club later that afternoon. Meeting was adjourned at 1:52 pm.

Respectfully submitted by: JA Watier, MAUT Recording Officer